

REMARKS/ARGUMENTS

Claims 1-20 are pending in this application. Claims 1-20 have been rejected.

In view of foregoing amendments and following remarks, Applicants request allowance of the Application.

CLAIMS 1-20 ARE FULLY SUPPORTED BY THE SPECIFICATION

35 U.S.C. § 112, first paragraph

Claims 1-20 stand rejected under 35 U.S.C. § 112, first paragraph, as allegedly failing to include support in the specification for the limitations "*if the determine associated configuration parameter is not located in the registry associated with the mobile device, initiating a process...*" (emphasis added by the Office Action of March 24, 2009, p. 3), as recited in claim 1.

This limitation recited in claim 1 is supported by the specification. For instance, page 8, lines 26-29 of the specification recite that a mobile solution descriptor maintains a representation of a registry for each mobile device – "in particular, the resources that are current (sic) installed on the mobile device with respect to the associated mobile application solution." The specification further states that the mobile solution descriptor, which maintains a representation of a registry for each mobile device (*see* specification, p. 8, lines 26-27), also "maintains a representation of all resources necessary for a particular mobile application solution and thus the resources that must be installed on a particular mobile device." Specification, p. 9, lines 1-3. During the synchronization process between a mobile device and the middleware server, the middleware server determines the appropriate resources to be deployed to a mobile device (specification, p. 10, lines 6-10) and whether application resources deployed at a mobile device need to be updated (specification, p. 10, lines 29-33). From the specification, one of skill in the art would readily understand that an application resource is deployed if (1) the resource is not located in the registry maintained by the descriptor file, or (2) if the resource needs to be updated. One of skill in the art would readily understand this because the descriptor file maintains both a registry that maintains the resources currently installed on the mobile device and a representation of all resources necessary for a particular mobile application solution. Thus, if a particular application resource is not located in the

registry but is maintained in the descriptor file as a resource necessary for a particular mobile application solution, the application resource would then necessarily have to be deployed.

Accordingly, Applicants submit the specification fully supports the limitations of claim 1 rejected under 35 U.S.C. § 112, first paragraph. For similar reasons as discussed above, claims 8, 13, and 20 also are fully supported by the specification. Applicants respectfully request reconsideration and withdrawal of the § 112, first paragraph, rejection of claims 1-20.

CLAIMS 1-20 DEFINE OVER MULTER IN VIEW OF SONG AND FURTHER IN VIEW OF VERT AND CHASMAN AND SUDHARSHANA

Claims 1-20 stand rejected under 35 U.S.C. § 103(a) as being allegedly unpatentable over U.S. Publication No. 2002/0040369 to Multer et al., (hereinafter "Multer"), in view of U.S. Publication No. 2003/0065947 to Song et al., (hereinafter "Song"), and further in view of U.S. Publication No. 2001/0008019 to Vert et al., (hereinafter "Vert"), U.S. Publication No. 2007/0180075 to Chasman et al., (hereinafter "Chasman"), and "OTA Mobile Device Software Management" to Sudharshana et al. (hereinafter "Sudharshana").

Multer, Song, Vert, Chasman, and Sudharshana, either alone or in combination, fail to teach or suggest every limitation of independent claims 1, 8, 13, and 20, as is required to maintain a proper § 103(a) rejection.

Consider, claim 1, as amended, which recites in part the following subject matter:
if the determined associated configuration parameter is not located in the registry associated with the mobile device,
generating a resource ID from both the associated device profile and the associated configuration parameter;
retrieving an application resource for the mobile device ***using the generated resource ID;*** and
configuring the mobile device using the retrieved application resource.

Multer fails to teach or suggest this subject matter. Multer discusses a pull synchronization scenario between a device and a server. In the pull synchronization scenario, data on the device is updated using a difference or delta update obtained from the server. Multer, paragraphs [0224]-[0227]. While the synchronization process uses a device name and a device class to identify a device type that is being synchronized (*see* Multer, paragraph [0223]), the

server does not use this device type or any configuration parameter to generate a resource ID that identifies the data to be deployed to the device. Rather, the data used to synchronize a device with a server is assigned a "Universally Unique Identifier (UUID)", with each UUID having "a unique 128 bit value which by may assigned by the system provider" (emphasis added). Multer, paragraph [0249]-[0250]. This assigned identifier is not generated from both a device profile and a configuration parameter. Thus, Multer clearly does not teach or suggest the above-recited subject matter of claim 1.

Song does not remedy the deficiencies of Multer. Song is directed to a registry architecture for securely sharing personal devices among different users. *See* Song, Abstract. As such, Song lacks any disclosure of configuring a software application on a mobile device in communication with a middleware server using the above-recited subject matter of claim 1.

Vert also fails to remedy the deficiencies of Multer and Song. Vert generally discusses "a method and system for transparently failing over a legacy application from a first system to a second system of a server cluster by tracking and checkpointing changes to application configuration information stored in a system's local registry". Vert, Abstract. As part of the failing over process, data to be checkpointed, such as registry data, is referenced by "a resource ID (a globally unique identifier or GUID) and a unique checkpoint ID, which is an arbitrary DWORD." Vert, paragraph [0052] (emphasis added). Thus, Vert's identifiers for checkpointed data are not generated from a device profile and configuration parameter, as is recited in claim 1. For at least this reason, Vert does not remedy the deficiencies of Multer and Song.

Chasman also fails to remedy the deficiencies of Multer, Song, and Vert. Chasman generally discusses the synchronization of objects in a master database and a replicated database using identifiers and version stamps of the objects. Chasman's identifiers are assigned by a sync server and are "determined by a combination of object type and identifier properties, which simplifies identifier assignments for new object instances". Thus, Chasman's identifiers also are not generated based on a device profile and a configuration parameter, as is recited in claim 1.

Sudharshana also fails to remedy the deficiencies of Multer, Song, Vert, and Chasman. Sudharshana generally discusses a software architecture for over the air management of software on a mobile device. *See* Sudharshana, p. 1, col. 1, Abstract. Software on a mobile equipment (ME) can be upgraded by applying software patches during an over the air synchronization process between a management server and a management client. Sudharshana, p. 2, col. 2, section 3.1 and FIGS. 2 and 3. Sudharshana describes a management server that maintains a Management Information Base (MIB), which stores different software patches that a ME needs to download. These patches are generated by an Application Patch Generator. The patch is stored in the MIB with its description, software version, Mobile Equipment model ID for which the patch is, and resource requirement for installation of the patch on the Mobile Equipment. Sudharshana, p. 4, section 3.11. Even though each patch is stored with this information, each new patch is assigned a “unique ID” (emphasis added) when generated. Sudharshana, p. 4, section 3.11. Sudharshana contains no teaching or suggestion that this unique ID is anything other than an arbitrarily assigned unique ID. Thus, Sudharshana’s patch ID clearly is not generated based on both a device profile and configuration parameter, as is recited in claim 1.

For at least this reason, Multer, Song, Vert, Chasman, and Sudharshana, either alone or in combination, fail to teach or suggest every element of independent claim 1, as is required to maintain a proper § 103(a) rejection. Independent claims 8, 13, and 20 are not rendered obvious by these references for similar reasons. Claims 2-7, 9-12, and 14-19 depend from independent claims 1, 8, and 13 and are similarly not rendered obvious for these reasons. Applicants therefore respectfully request reconsideration and withdrawal of the rejection of claims 1-20 under 35 U.S.C. § 103(a).

CONCLUSION

All outstanding rejections have been overcome. In view of the foregoing amendments and remarks, the application is in clear condition for allowance. Issuance of a Notice of Allowance is earnestly solicited.

Although not believed necessary, the Office is hereby authorized to charge any fees required under 37 C.F.R. § 1.16 or § 1.17 or credit any overpayments to Deposit Account No.

11-0600.

The Office is invited to contact the undersigned at (408) 975-7500 to discuss any matter regarding this application.

Respectfully submitted,

KENYON & KENYON LLP

Date: May 26, 2009

/Mark D. Yuan/

Mark D. Yuan

(Registration No.: 57,312)

Kenyon & Kenyon LLP
333 West San Carlos Street, Suite 600
San Jose, CA 95110

Telephone: (408) 975-7500
Facsimile: (408) 975-7501